

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3 and 5-17 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sayers (U.S. Patent No. 6,539,237).

With regard to claims 1, 10, 13, 16 and 17, these claims require either that locally significant messages are inserted in a globally significant message, as in claims 1 and 13, or that a tandem node transfers supplementary services information from the first communication device to the second communication device, as in claims 10, 16 and 17.

There is no indication in Sayers that the supplementary services information is transferred from one node to the other. Indeed, it appears that any other information than a call request is not carried forward into the next leg of the call. See column 20, lines 1-3, and lines 51-55.

It is therefore submitted that these claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 3 and 5-9 depend from claim 1, claims 11-12 depend from claim 10, and claims 14-15 depend from claim 13. These claims should be ruled allowable over the prior art for that reason and for their own merits. With regard to claim 3, Sayers does not teach a VoX network in which the supplementary information is preserved and locally significant messages are inserted into global messages, nor that the VoX network is a VoFR, VoIP or VoATM network as in claim 5. With regard to claims 6 and 7, Sayers does not teach that the use of the RELEASE and RELEASE COMPLETE messages are used in conjunction with messages in which locally significant messages are inserted in global messages. Further, Sayers does not teach insertion of locally significant messages into a global message, much less that the global message is a DISCONNECT or a FACILITY message. It is therefore submitted that claims 3 and 5-9 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.


With regard to claims 11 and 12, Sayers does not teach transferring supplemental services information from a first communication device to a second communication device where those devices are routers, or where the two devices are part of one router. It is therefore submitted that claims 11 and 12 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

With regard to claims 14 and 15, Sayers does not teach the software of claim 13, much less that the software is contained in a computer file directly transferred from a computing device or a downloadable file. The downloadable file referred to in Sayers has to do with the messages, not with a medium containing software instructions to implement the instructions of claim 13. It is therefore submitted that claims 14 and 15 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sayers under 35 USC 103(a). However, as stated above in the Statement of Common Ownership, the subject matter of the Sayers reference and the instant application were commonly owned at the time this invention as claimed herein was made. Therefore, Sayers is not a valid reference and these claims should be ruled allowable for that reason.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,
MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.


Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
503-222-3613
Customer No. 20575